



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

been accomplished in the last quarter-century, but much remains to be done. How can still better results be attained?

Of the present requirements none can safely be omitted; on the contrary, a more satisfactory compliance with them should be insisted upon. Facts show that many a man graduates with high honor, yet whose "manuscript would disgrace a boy of twelve." In addition to present requirements, the following subjects seem valuable,—elementary prosody, a brief sketch of English literature and of English and American history, a rational etymology, and a real knowledge of at least four English prose works.

The main improvement needed, however, is in the methods of teaching. After a brief outline of grammar, etymology, etc., has been taught, and even while teaching this outline, English books calculated to interest the pupil should be read, and the instruction be based chiefly on them. Thus the English language would be taught, not (as now) only certain books about the English language. Thus, too, material the most abundant would be furnished for composition, and the pupil not be required, as he now is, to produce something out of nothing.

The plan here recommended has been partially tried twice, and each time successfully.

Dr. Francis B. Gummere, of New Bedford, made some remarks on this paper bearing especially upon the difference of treatment of English in the schools and colleges. The former, he said, only too often teach English in a mediæval way, while the colleges follow the modern system. A clashing of methods naturally comes when the two are combined as in the case of the boy who receives his elementary instruction in the schools, and afterward goes up to college, the result being an annoyance to the pupil, because he has to unlearn much that is incorrect, and especially taxing to the teacher who has to devote much time that could have been more profitably spent, had the pupil received proper instruction from the beginning. The speaker particularly emphasized the point that the Association should move with all energy toward better methods for the primary schools in the teaching of English.

Prof. A. M. Elliott then read a paper on

9. "The Realgymnasium Question in Germany."

The present struggle for university reform in Germany bears so much resemblance to the reform which is taking place in this country and which this Association has at heart to promote, that it was thought a glance at the question would be of interest at this stage of our development.

The leading features of the discussion in Germany and in the United States are as nearly identical as the differences of the school and university systems in the two countries could admit. The primal cause at the bottom of the controversy in both places is the same, that is, monopoly; the principles fought for have ever been the same, namely, equality of rights: *Lehrfreiheit*, *Lernfreiheit* and *Studienfreiheit*; the pivotal point about which the whole movement has taken place and is taking place is the self-same in both, that is, the cutting out of the existing system some disciplina in order to give room, in accordance with the demands of modern culture, for another or for other disciplinae which are held to bear a more direct relation to our present life.

From the beginning of this discussion, the same subject has been selected and agreed upon by common consent of educators as that special one in whose withdrawal from the present scheme, the system would be the least injured, to state the proposition negatively, or by the absence of which and by the substitution of other teaching material in its place, the system would be improved according to the opinion held by the majority of the reformers. Not only in America, but also in European countries generally: Great Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, Austria and Hungary, it is the Greek which is believed to be the least essential to our general modern culture and hence the whole force of the struggle has centred in the so-called Greek question, where, very often, the main issue, the necessity of reducing the number of subjects taught, is lost sight of altogether and the fight is carried on as though there could be no virtue in Greek in any circumstances. The practical life in this country and the rapid growth of applied science have naturally had much to do with the extreme phase of opinion that one meets here sometimes and which would lead its advocates to strike this important branch of learning from the college curriculum altogether and make us depend, for classical culture, upon the Latin alone. The more general view, however, and the one which is destined to prevail in the end is exactly the same as that held by the majority of German educators, namely, that the circumstances and calling of life should have their influence in the training given and that the pupil should have the privilege of choice of studies accordingly, so that the student who is looking forward to the profession of general teaching, for example, would pursue a scheme of work naturally different from that of the man who is preparing for a business career, or, the worker in Natural Science should have special chances for the cultivation of his powers of observation for which the material in other departments offers a less favorable opportunity. These views would seem most natural and yet we know how bitterly opposed they are by certain educators whose opinions carry great weight in the education of our youth.

It is now a century and three quarters (1709) since the Prediger Semmler established a school in Halle and gave to it the name *Realschule*, the first time this appellation was used in this sense. In the

same year that Semmler named his novel school, the Royal Society of Sciences expressed itself in terms of encouragement for the new departure, to wit, it held Semmler's plan as "feasible, praiseworthy and advisable" "eine thunliche, löbliche und rathsame Sache," and furthermore expressed the opinion that "it would be a good thing to have boys instructed in a certain mechanical school in order that they might have their intelligence enlightened and be able to tell the quality and worth of the materials and objects necessary to life". It will be seen, therefore, that in the beginning the whole aim of this instruction was a practical one and there is no thought whatever of such a development of the institutions that impart it as to count them competitors with the old established Gymnasium. But if we come down about four generations, that is one hundred and fifty years, we find that circumstances have changed so much, so many improvements have been introduced into the Realsystem, the original purpose has been so modified, the number of studies have been so increased and the kinds of study so supplemented, that we have in the Educational Law and Examination ordinance of 1859 the organization of a definite and well-established system for the Realschule in every way co-ordinated with that of the Gymnasium proper. "For the arrangement", we read in said ordinance, "of the Realschool, the immediate necessities of a practical life cannot be the norm, but the end must be kept in view to raise the youth entrusted to it to that state of intellectual development which constitutes the necessary preparation for a free and independent comprehension of the later calling in life. It is not an Institute of Technology, that is, professional school, but it has, just as the Gymnasium, to do with general educational means and fundamental principles of general knowledge (sie sind keine Fachschulen, sondern haben es, wie das Gymnasium, mit allgemeinen Bildungsmitteln und grundlegenden Kenntnissen zu thun). And hence between Gymnasium and Realschule there exists no material opposition but only a reciprocal, supplementary relation, (zwischen Gymnasium und Realschule findet sich daher kein prinzipieller Gegensatz, sondern ein Verhältniss gegenseitiger Ergänzung.) The year 1859 thus becomes a mile-stone, so to speak, on the highway of history of the question now before German educators. It was then that the state called the Realschool into a legitimate and recognized existence, with its present definite organization, alongside of its sister institution, the Gymnasium.

But if we would hold in our minds the first epochs through which this problem has passed, we must remember another date about thirty years earlier than this (1832) when the provisional regulation was published, limiting the Realschool course of study to six years, and hence, two years later (1834), when the present order of things was established for the Gymnasium, there could still be no question whatever as to the relative merits of the two schools. Such a thing as competition, then, was not thought of fifty years ago. It is only in this second period of development, (measuring the periods accord-

ing to governmental statutes) from 1832-59 that the vigor of the new-comer began to manifest itself and, through the extension of her domain of work, the chasm which had hitherto separated the two systems was narrowed, while the sympathies of the people for the younger but more energetic sister increased, the numbers of students grew rapidly larger, till finally the government was forced to send forth its enactment wherein the two educational institutions, now become rivals, were declared to be upon a similar footing so far as the general results of their training were concerned, in other words, they were no longer to hold the relation of superior to inferior but that of two perfectly co-ordinated, harmoniously organised systems with different bases.

Both Institutions now receive the same length of course (nine years); a like number of subjects is taught and a like number of hours of weekly exercises is held; both have equally well-trained teachers paid according to the same general system (by far the most of them in Realschools are Gymnasium graduates); both have the same equipment and facilities for work; they both take their pupils at the same age and require the same preparation in order to be accepted in their classes. In these circumstances nothing would seem more natural than that the two establishments should have equal rights and privileges with reference to the admission of their graduates into the various faculties of the university. This is not the case, however, and herein lies the whole trouble to-day, the cardinal point in the Real-gymnasium problem. *Gleiche Berechtigung* are the watch words to which the hearts of the reformers are tuned and they cling to their purpose of having the same rights as their opponents with a tenacity that signally marks the justice of their cause while the shibboleth of the old party, the advocates of an uncompromising conservatism, is exclusive privilege for the Gymnasium as training school for the university. And they insist upon this point with all the ardor characteristic of a series of years of unquestioned rights, though they were the sole possessors of the key to the university for scarcely three decades and a half (1834-1870). This *noli-me-tangere* doctrine assumes a fresh importance in their minds for each step their vigorous rivals advance and for each new privilege wrung from them they would willingly have us believe the whole fabric of society is about to crumble away simply because the cry of the fall of German idealism and of the gigantic strides of materialism will not frighten common sense out of the average XIX Century mind. They have raised the flood-gates just enough to realize the danger and now, by misrepresentation, or a stolid ignoring of facts, they hope to check the current for a while longer.

From the date of official recognition of their co-ordinated standing with the Gymnasium, the friends of the new departure have struggled for all those rights of which her elder sister has held the monopoly, namely, that their graduates should also be admitted without question

to any Faculty they may choose in the scheme of university studies. Before the memorable date '59, no student of the Realschool had the privilege to matriculate in any department of the university. This state of things would seem inconsistent, to say the least, to a foreigner who knows nothing of the prejudices involved and who is unable to feel the full force of tradition in which the whole subject is wrapped for the native German. Looking on at a distance, it cannot fail to strike us, I think, that the presumption of not only an extension but of equal privileges on the part of the Realgymnasium is the natural and legitimate outcome of the parity of studies and this struggle for more extended rights has not been without success, though complete equality of privileges with the Gymnasium in reference to university work does not yet exist.

Scarcely a decade (1870) had passed after the two institutions were officially proclaimed co-ordinate when the Realschool Abiturienten were admitted into the departments of Mathematics, Natural Science and Modern Languages and again another decade (1882) and all the Realschools of I. order have obtained the special appellation of *Realgymnasium* without, in this case, however, obtaining that extension of their domain which they have so earnestly coveted for the last quarter of a century, namely that their students should be admitted to the departments of Law and Medicine in the university.

It will be observed that these limitations both within the university and after the university course is finished, operate very materially against the Realschool graduates but that they had once been admitted into the pale of the university was a great step forward and broke the backbone of the monopoly of the Gymnasium to which alone the privilege before this was accorded of preparing students for the university. With this breach in the monopoly-doctrine the friends of the Realschool pushed forward for more extensive privileges and for the last fifteen years the struggle has been a bitter one between the two parties, the one, advocates of Realschool interests claiming like rights with their opponents, the other, supporters of the Gymnasium system denying that the Real-graduates have that general training necessary to a broad and liberal culture. It is especially to the department of Medicine that the Realschool supporters have turned their attention, believing that their special line of instruction gives better preparation for the study of medicine than that obtained in the rival institutions. But after a struggle of twelve years, the Law of 1882, by which new plans of study were prescribed for all the higher institutions in Prussia, brought no relief to the Realschool except the one above mentioned to change the name to Realgymnasium.

Of the various objections adduced by the monopolists against granting equal privileges to Realschool and Gymnasium students, many are too frivolous to be mentioned and others are of so general a nature as to be of like force against any system of training. We may cite the following two or three specimens:

I) That the Realstudents are unable to understand and explain the termini technici coming from the Greek.

II) It would be encouraging the materialistic tendencies of modern education to receive them.

III) Lack of idealism would be fostered thereby.

IV) Lack of unselfish devotion to Science is engendered in their students.

And just here it may be well to stop a moment to notice the action of the University of Berlin in reference to this subject. The strongest centre of opposition to the new order of things is found here and we are all acquainted, perhaps, with Prof. Hofmann's Rectoratsrede that has become famous, and having been translated into English, has had extensive circulation in America as a sort of campaign document for classical studies. Hofmann spoke and wrote against Realschool graduates not knowing that four out of six of his own assistants were Realscholars and when a list of all the Realgraduates studying Natural Science was sent him and he was challenged, in the face of facts contrary to those he had stated, to publicly acknowledge his mistake, he did not have the manly courage to do so.

At the beginning of 1880, following a proposition of Prof. Droysen the whole Phil. Faculty of the Berlin University occupied itself with the Realschool question for the second time, in order to report to the Cultus minister (8th of march 1880) on the admission of Realschool graduates to the study of Mathematics, Natural Science and Modern Languages, that is, in accordance with the results from experience since 1870. Whatever unbiased reader follows this document must readily understand, I think, the destroying criticism against it by Prof. Strack in the "Centralorgan für die Interessen des Realschulwesens" for Nov. 1881. In this Enquête, Prof. Droysen, the proposer of it, does not express any opinion, so that one would like to ask what experience led him to suggest such a thing. In all, thirty six professors signed the report but most of them in a general way according to departments; only ten put their names to it. Thirteen only out of thirty six say anything about *experience*. Eleven out of thirty six had signed the report of 1869, but only two out of the original eleven put down their *experience* in accordance with the spirit of the report, that is, in opposition to the Realschools.

The present position of the Realschools in Prussia is a critical one. In his address before the Versammlung der Realschulfreunde on April 9th of last year (1884), Dr. Steinbart, Director of the Realgymnasium at Duisburg, shows clearly how injurious it is to Realgymnasien that their *trial-period* should be prolonged. Parents grow tired of having their sons refused the privilege, after having gone through a creditable course of study, to enter any branches they may wish of a professional career that is freely open to their friends of the Gymnasium. A trial-period such as is now forced upon the Realgymna-

sien (before 1879 no such thing was thought of) is contrary to the tradition and to the true sense of reform and the author thinks if the Realschools are thus held back for some years, many of them will have been changed into regular Gymnasien and this will come about from the fact that parents, whose sons are destined for the Ministry, for Law, or for Medicine, prefer to send them, from the beginning, into those institutions whence they have a right to pass into the respective faculties of the university.

The meeting then adjourned till 3 p. m.

The fourth session was called to order by the Chairman, Prof. Sheldon, at 3.15 p. m., and, before proceeding to the regular reading of communications, reports from the several committees were called for and submitted, namely,

1. From the committee appointed to draw up an answer to Prof. Vietor's letter, as follows:

Resolved, That in response to the recent cordial action of the "Neuphilologischen Section" of the "Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner," towards its young and far-away sister, the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, desires to return, through a committee appointed for the purpose, an expression of its high appreciation of this friendly attention on the part of the elder Society, and at the same time to offer congratulations upon the eminent services so long rendered by it to the cause of sound learning and scientific scholarship, not only in Germany, but throughout the learned world,

which was unanimously accepted, and the Secretary instructed to forward a copy of the same on behalf of the Association to the Modern Language Section at the next meeting of the German Philologenversammlung;

2. From the committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's report:

Cash on hand January 1, 1885.....	\$108 00
Receipts for 1885.....	354 00
Total.....	\$462 00
Expenditures.....	345 55
Balance on hand January 1, 1886.....	\$116 45

which was found correct and accepted;

3. From the committee on names of officers of the Association for the ensuing year:

FRANKLIN CARTER, President—*President of Williams College.*

A. M. ELLIOTT, Secretary, *Johns Hopkins University.*

HENRY A. TODD, Treasurer, *Johns Hopkins University.*

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

THE PRESIDENT, SECRETARY, TREASURER, *Ex-Officio.*

T. WHITING BANCROFT, *Brown University, R. I.*

EDWARD S. SHELDON, *Harvard College, Mass.*

BERNARD F. O'CONNOR, *Columbia College, N. Y.*

ALCÉE FORTIER, *Tulane University of Louisiana, La.*

SYLVESTER PRIMER, *Charleston College, S.C.*

J. M. GARNETT, *University of Virginia, Va.*

JAMES M. HART, *University of Cincinnati, Ohio.*

EDWARD L. WALTER, *University of Michigan.*

J. K. NEWTON, *Oberlin College, Ohio.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

H. C. G. BRANDT, *Hamilton College, N. Y.*

JAS. A. HARRISON, *Washington and Lee University, Va.*

which was accepted, and the members therein named were unanimously appointed on motion of Prof. Hewett.

Prof. Sylvester Primer then read a paper on

10. "Adjectival and Adverbial Relations; their Influence upon the Government of the Verb."

The writer begins his article with the statement that the logical factitive is most perfectly expressed by the adjective, which, on account of its close functional relation to the adverb, is often replaced by the latter, an exchange easily explained when we consider that a modifier often performs a double function in serving both as an attribute of the passive object and qualifying the verbal idea. This double functional duty forms the very essence of the factitive and causes the vacillation and uncertainty in deciding whether the verbal or substantival idea should be modified. Wherever the modifier affects both elements, the inflectional languages usually employ the neuter of the adjective and this adverbio-adjectival modification, together with the vagueness of the boundary between the adverbial and adjectival ideas, explains in part the use of the adverb as factitive. The difficulty experienced in explaining this modification is that it is neither wholly attributive, nor yet predicative-attributive, nor adverbial, but compound in nature wherein the adjective produces a more intense effect upon the verbal idea than the adverb.